

**REMARKS*****Summary of the Corrected Amendment***

Upon entry of the pending amendment, the specification and claims 55, 83, 86, 99, and 114 will have been amended. Accordingly, claims 55 – 114 currently remain pending.

***Summary of the Official Action***

In the instant Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that claims 62, 63, 65 – 73, 76 – 82, 89 – 101, and 104 – 113 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if presented in independent forms that include the features of their respective base claims. Further, the Examiner objected to the specification and rejected claim 114 based upon a formal matter and rejected claims 55 – 61, 64, 74, 75, 83 – 88, 102, 103, and 114 over the art of record. By the present amendment and remarks, Applicant submits that the objections and rejections have been overcome, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action and allowance of the present application.

***Acknowledgment of Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claims 62, 63, 65 – 73, 76 – 82, 89 – 101, and 104 – 113 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if presented in independent forms that include the features of their respective base claims. Further, Applicant notes that, while none of these claims are being presented into independent and allowable form at this time, any of these claims can be presented into allowable form in a subsequent response.

***Objection to the Specification is Moot***

Applicant submits the objection to the specification based upon informal matters is now moot in view of the amendments to specification. By the amendment, the amendments

suggested by the Examiner have been made to address and overcome the informal matters identified by the Examiner in the pending Office Action.

***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, is Moot***

Applicant submits the formal rejection of claim 114 is now moot in view of the present amendment to claim 114. By the amendment, a claim 114 has been amended to address and overcome the Examiner's formal rejection of the claim.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the formal rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and acknowledgment that this claim is fully in compliance with the requirements of the statute is requested.

***Traversal of Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)***

***1. Over Promonet***

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 55 – 60 and 83 – 88 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by PROMONET et al. (European Patent No. EP 0 607 720) [hereinafter "PROMONET"]. The Examiner refers to claim 5 of PROMONET and asserts this shows a manner of drying web materials wherein heat is generated at least in part inside the roller by combusting fuel with air and oxygen. The Examiner further asserts the roller of PROMONET is operating as a catalytic burner, in which the cylindrical surface contains a means for ignition for combustible gases to produce a flame clinging to the surface. Applicant traverses the Examiner's assertions.

By the present amendment, Applicant's independent claim 55 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, generating heat at least in part inside the roller by *catalytically combusting* a fuel with air or oxygen at least in some regions inside the roller, and Applicant's independent claim 83 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, a heating unit comprising a *catalyst arranged on*

*an inside of the roller* to combust a fuel with air or oxygen. Applicant submits PROMONET fails to disclose at least the above-noted features of the invention.

The present invention provides a catalyst on an inside of the roller. When a fuel with air or oxygen is fed to the catalyst inside the roller, an exothermic reaction occurs and heat is generated in the catalyst. Thus, the heat is generated through catalytic combustion of the fuel at least in part inside the roller.

PROMONET discloses a dryer cylinder in which combustible gas fed into a distribution chamber 7. The gas is ignited and then heats surface 6 to a very high temperature. Moreover, the heat produced in PROMONET radiates into annular space 14 to ultimately heat the dryer cylinder shell. As is well known, this type of heating is known as convection heating. Further, in contrast to the invention, PROMONET fails to disclose catalytically combusting a fuel with air or oxygen at least in some regions inside the roller, as recited in at least independent claim 55, and fails to disclose a catalyst arranged on an inside of the roller to combust a fuel with air or oxygen, as recited in at least independent claim 83, as now amended.

While the Examiner asserts claim 5 of PROMONET provides evidence that PROMONET operates as a catalytic burner, Applicant notes PROMONET fails to disclose or claim a catalyst or catalytic burning. Applicant submits the Examiner's interpretation of PROMONET's claim 5 is based upon Applicant's own disclosure and not upon any reasonable reading of PROMONET's disclosure. Therefore, should the Examiner wish to maintain the pending rejection, Applicant requests that the Examiner identify specific disclosure of a catalyst or of some exothermic reaction in a catalyst within the roller.

As PROMONET fails to disclose at least the above-noted features of at least independent claims 55 and 83, Applicant submit the applied art fails to show each and every feature of

invention. Therefore, Applicant submits the Examiner has failed to establish an adequate evidentiary basis to support a rejection of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), such that this pending rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Further, Applicant submits that claims 56 – 60 and 84 – 88 are allowable over PROMONET at least for the reason that these claims depend from allowable base claims and because these claims recite additional features that further defines the invention. In particular, Applicant submits that PROMONET fails to show each and every recited feature recited in claims 56 – 60 and 84 – 88.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 55 – 60 and 83 – 88 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and indicate that these claims are allowable.

2. Over Hemsath

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 55, 56, 60, 61, 64, 74, 75, 83, 88, 89, 92, 102, and 103 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by HEMSATH et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,693,015) [hereinafter “HEMSATH”]. The Examiner asserts HEMSATH shows a drying cylinder having a structure rotatable about a fixed structure, wherein a continuous web is passed along the exterior surface for drying, and a burner 50 receives fuel gas and air and combusts inside the roller. Applicant traverses the Examiner’s assertions.

As discussed above, Applicant’s independent claim 55, as now amended, recites, *inter alia*, generating heat at least in part inside the roller by *catalytically combusting* a fuel with air or oxygen at least in some regions inside the roller. Further, Applicant’s independent claim 83, as now amended, recites, *inter alia*, a heating unit comprising *a catalyst arranged on an inside of*

*the roller* to combust a fuel with air or oxygen. Applicant submits HEMSATH fails to disclose at least the above-noted features of the invention.

The present invention provides a catalyst on an inside of the roller. When a fuel with air or oxygen is fed to the catalyst inside the roller, an exothermic reaction occurs and heat is generated in the catalyst. Thus, the heat is generated through catalytic combustion of the fuel at least in part inside the roller.

Applicant submits that HEMSATH, like PROMONET discussed above, operates on the principle of convection heating and, therefore, fails to provide any disclosure of catalytically combusting a fuel with air or oxygen at least in some regions inside the roller, as recited in at least independent claim 55, and fails to provide any disclosure of a catalyst arranged on an inside of the roller to combust a fuel with air or oxygen, as recited in at least independent claim 83, as now amended.

As HEMSATH fails to disclose at least the above-noted features of at least independent claims 55 and 83, Applicant submit the applied art fails to show each and every feature of invention. Therefore, Applicant submits the Examiner has failed to establish an adequate evidentiary basis to support a rejection of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), such that this pending rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Further, Applicant submits that claims 56, 60, 61, 64, 74, 75, 88, 89, 92, 102, and 103 are allowable over HEMSATH at least for the reason that these claims depend from allowable base claims and because these claims recite additional features that further defines the invention. In particular, Applicant submits that HEMSATH fails to show each and every recited feature recited in claims 56, 60, 61, 64, 74, 75, 88, 89, 92, 102, and 103.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 55, 56, 60, 61, 64, 74, 75, 83, 88, 89, 92, 102, and 103 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and indicate that these claims are allowable.

***Application is Allowable***

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that each and every pending claim of the present invention meets the requirements for patentability under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103, and respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate allowance of each and every pending claim of the present invention.

***Authorization to Charge Deposit Account***

The undersigned authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, including any extensions of time fees required to place the application in condition for allowance by Examiner's Amendment, to Deposit Account No. 19 - 0089 in order to maintain pendency of this application.


**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that none of the references of record, either taken alone or in any proper combination thereof, anticipate or render obvious the Applicant's invention, as recited in each of claims 55 – 114. The claims have been amended to eliminate any arguable basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112. In addition, the applied references of record have been discussed and distinguished, while significant claimed features of the present invention have been pointed out.

Further, any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the outstanding Office Action and allowance of the present application and all the claims therein are respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,  
Fabian DOELING



Neil F. Greenblum  
Reg. No. 28,394

Robert W. Mueller  
Reg. No. 35,043

May 25, 2008  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191